

THE GERMAN REPLY

THE SEVERAL German notes are cordial and pacific in tenor. They relieve the tension in the degree that the imperial government disclaims purpose for the sinking of the Lusitania, and the Nebraska. From the standpoint of international usage, these cases presented a stronger ground for American protest, than the sinking of the Lusitania.

Since Germany declares that the Lusitania and Nebraska were attacked in the belief they were British ships, it follows regrets will be expressed and reparation made.

German representations regarding the Lusitania are not so cheerful in hint of amicable adjustment of disagreements.

Germany declares, in effect, that the Lusitania was an armed ship of war, and therefore not under the protection of the customs which provide for visit and search, and which demand that the crew and passengers shall be put in a place of safety. Those usages apply to merchantmen, but not to war vessels.

Germany's reasons for describing the Lusitania as a warship are based upon the allegations that the ship was constructed in part from the naval fund of Great Britain, that she is registered as a part of the navy of Great Britain, that she had cannon mounted and concealed, that she carried munitions of war, and that she carried Canadian troops, who were to take part in the war.

In conclusion, Germany applies strong language to the conduct of the British government, in permitting passengers to be carried under such conditions.

In the concluding paragraphs of her reply Germany seems to indicate a purpose to continue the sinking of enemy ships according to her submarine practice, unless the conditions of the Declaration of London, those relating to the passage of food stuffs, are complied with.

For the present it may be hoped that diplomatic relations will continue. The evident purpose of Germany, in presenting her case in this way, is to raise the question of fact as to whether the Lusitania was a war ship.

Such a question of fact would be a proper question to submit to a court of arbitration, and perhaps it will not be far from the mark to suppose that Germany's next step, in case this government shall regard the Lusitania as a merchantman, will be to ask for the submission of the question to an international tribunal.

As before, the determination of what is best to be done rests with President Wilson as the head of the American government. He will have peace, if peace is possible. He will leave nothing undone consistent with the honor of the United States, to continue the friendly relations between this country and Germany, and between the United States and all the world.

A COMPARISON OF ASSESSED VALUATIONS UNDER TWO MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS

WHEN WILLIAM H. MARIGOLD was mayor, the grand list jumped \$25,000,000 almost overnight. The increase was not a growth in property, but an arbitrary adjustment of values. All property had been undervalued for taxation, some of it at fifty percent of market value, some of it as low as 25 per cent. of market value.

The community determined to conform more accurately to the law requiring full market value.

This adjustment reached lands and dwellings with much effectiveness, but left property in manufactures still greatly under-assessed.

During the administration of Mayor Buckingham an effort was made to equalize valuations, by bringing manufactures nearer to full market value.

This process was continued through his term and to a degree during the term of Mayor Wilson. During the three years Mayor Wilson has been in office the grand list has increased \$17,000,000, not by actual increase in property values, but largely by arbitrary increases in assessed valuation.

At the present time houses and lands are assessed in the main at full value. Manufacturing property is assessed, in the main, at fifty per cent of value.

These two sharp ascensions in assessed valuation, that during Marigold's term and that during Wilson's term, are from the same cause. There is this remarkable difference, however, in results.

The boost in Marigold's time was followed by a sharp decline in the tax rate.

But the boost in Wilson's time has been followed by a mountainous increase in the tax rate and in city expenditures. Instead of higher valuations being succeeded by a lower tax rate, and a decreased debt, as in Marigold's day, they have been followed by a higher tax rate and a staggering debt. It may be said of the municipal government now blessing Bridgeport, that it has developed the art of spending to a degree before unheard of in the city's history.

THE VALUE OF TRAFFIC RULES

IN MOST OF the jitney accidents two elements appear, one of which is not a jitney element. Most of these accidents, like the majority of automobile mishaps, are brought about by a disregard of the elemental principles of safe driving, and by disobeying traffic rules.

To enforce traffic rules rigidly would prevent most of the accidents that occur in the central portions of the city.

The police should regard with unfavorable eye the practice of cutting corners. This is perhaps the most dangerous single violation of traffic rules. Coming sharply from a side street into a main thoroughfare is another dangerous practice.

Certain streets, such as Main street, State street, Fairfield avenue, Water street, William street, Noble avenue, Park avenue, and others that might be selected, should be classified as principal thoroughfares, and the burden of coming into them from side streets should be placed upon the driver who is entering.

Neither can there be the safety that should exist, until teams and teamsters are held to the same degree of responsibility under the traffic rules, as other vehicles. A team cutting a corner, presents a situation as threatening, as though it were an automobile. A few days rigid enforcement of two or three simple rules, would be beneficial to everybody. In a little

while all classes of traffic would come to know that the rules are for the protection of everybody. Failure to obey the rules is simply not understanding what they are for, and not knowing they are made to be kept.

NAUGHTY MR. WALSH

YOUNG MR. ROCKEFELLER appears to have blinded most of the members of the Industrial Commission with the consciousness of his pomp and wealth. Current newspaper report is prolific in such headings as, "Walsh only member who examines Rockefeller." A singular bashfulness on the part of other commissioners, or a singular failure on Rockefeller's part to know anything the commission ought to know. The country even is informed that the other commissioners are disturbed because of the drastic quality of Commissioner Walsh's questions. It seems these have not been couched in the proper tone of respectful servility. What should be done to a Federal commissioner who does not know his proper place, and who presumes to cross examine a leading millionaire as ordinary lawyers question ordinary defendants? Oh, for the good old days of the Bastille, and the chopping block!

GIOLITTI

Signor Giovanni Giolitti, for many years known as "the real king of Italy," and since the war the leader of the Neutralist or peace party, was born in Mondovi, and is 73 years old. He first became prominent in Italian politics some 33 years ago, when he entered the Chamber of Deputies from Dronero. In 1889 he held his first portfolio in the government as Minister of the Treasury. Signor Giolitti has been four times Prime Minister of Italy. His first administration as Premier began in 1892 and lasted about two years. In 1901 he was made Minister of the Interior, and in 1903 he again became Prime Minister. Since then he has been, to a large extent, the power behind the throne in Italy, and has made and unmade governments to suit himself. In all the recent affairs in Italy he has played a prominent part, and by his advocacy of the neutrality of Italy has won for himself the bitter hatred of the Interventionist party, which from the first advocated the intervention of Italy on the side of the Allies. From the beginning of the struggle Signor Giolitti used all his great influence on the side of peace, declaring that his country could win from Austria all that it desired without plunging the nation into war. For a dozen years Signor Giolitti almost absolutely controlled the Italian Chamber of Deputies. A remarkable illustration of his power was afforded by the downfall of the Sonnino government. On one day the ministry had a majority of 300 votes in the Chamber and the next day the "uncrowned king" had lost it. Signor Giolitti, at an end, and the Chamber hastened to obey his wishes.

DARK CONTINENT'S "U. S. A." PASSES 5TH MILESTONE TODAY.

This last day of May is the fifth birthday of Dark Continent's "U. S. A." The Union of South Africa. It was on May 31, 1910, that the four British colonies in South Africa—Cape Colony, the Transvaal and Orange Free State—were formed into a great federation under the British flag. The formation of the union was a triumph of statesmanship, for it marked the final step in granting the largest measure of independence and self-government to England's late enemies, the Boers of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State. Never before in the history of a warring world have the wounds of a bloody and terrible conflict so quickly healed as in South Africa.

Only fifteen years after their terrible war against the forces of England, the Boers are now fighting under the banner of their late enemy. This new allegiance is all the more remarkable when it is considered that the Boers, in their struggle with England, had the support and aid of Germany. While a few of the irreconcilables raised the standard of revolt, they quickly discovered that the masses of the Boers were loyal to the Union, and the independent inclination was speedily suppressed by Gen. Louis Botha, the Boer soldier and statesman who has been premier of the Union since its inception. The fervent patriotism and devotion and reprehensible of the black population of South Africa was manifested by the anti-German riots in Cape Town and Johannesburg, following the sinking of the Lusitania.

As a result of the Union's participation in the present world-war, Gen. Botha and other South African leaders confidently expect to add largely to the armed power and prestige of their country. Botha's men have already overrun German Southwest Africa and have captured Windhoek, the capital, and other principal towns. In addressing his soldiers, Gen. Botha declared that the capture of Windhoek was of the "utmost importance to the empire and the Union of South Africa, as it means practically complete possession of German Southwest Africa." While the German territory is not now of much importance, it offers natural resources capable of tremendous development. The annexation of German Southwest Africa would mean the addition of 322,450 square miles to the area of the Union. The population of the German colony is about a quarter of a million, but there are only about 5,000 whites among the permanent residents. The Germans have not been very successful in the development of German Southwest Africa. Where in the British African possessions there are school houses, the Germans have built barracks. In German Southwest Africa the natives have not taken kindly to the invaders and it has been necessary to import white labor to construct railroads and other public works.

Since its birth five years ago today the Union of South Africa has faced many serious problems. The equality of the Dutch and English languages, and the free entry to positions of political power by both nationalities, tended to weld the once warring whites, but the race question, as presented by the presence of so many blacks, has often reached an acute stage. The great strike and strike early in 1914 was a serious manifestation of industrial unrest. On the whole, however, the infant nation has made wonderful progress. The reconciliation of Boer and Britisher has reached a point where it can withstand the test of war, and offers the strange spectacle of the enemies of fifteen years ago fighting shoulder to shoulder in a common cause.

T LYFORD BROTHERS B
TRY SPRING CUSTOM SUITS BUY
Y East Side and West End Y

JEWS IN ENGLAND

The first widespread movement to obtain full political rights for the Jews of England was commenced 86 years ago today, when the Hebrews of the country presented a petition to Parliament. Six years later, in 1835, the movement had progressed so far that David Salomons was elected sheriff of London, and an act was passed enabling him to hold the office. Two years later another Jew, Moses Montefiore, was chosen for the same position, and was knighted by the Queen, being the first Hebrew to be so honored. In 1849 Baron Lionel de Rothschild was elected to Parliament, and was again returned in 1852 and 1857, but was not permitted to take his seat until 1858, when an act was passed permitting Hebrews to sit in the House of Commons. Alderman Salomons became the first Jewish lord mayor of London, and his cabinet was afterwards elected to Parliament. In 1868 Benjamin Disraeli, of Jewish extraction, became Prime Minister of Great Britain. Since then Jews have been eligible to every office within the gift of the English people, and many of the leading statesmen of England are and have been Hebrews.

COL SEELY, FORMER BRITISH SECRETARY OF WAR, 47 TODAY.

Col. John Edward Bernard Seely, who was British secretary of war in the Asquith cabinet, will be indisposed during the Ulster troubles due to the loss of his official health, he was born forty-seven years ago today. He was the youngest of seven children of an English nobleman, and was educated at the school of St. John's, Cambridge, and the son of a M. P. After leaving Cambridge the future cabinet member was called to the bar and began to take an active interest in politics, thus following in the footsteps of his father and grandfather and elder brother. He achieved his military title as the lieutenant-colonel commanding the Hampshire Militia, and was awarded his military honors with the Imperial Yeomanry in South Africa. His bravery in that struggle won him a mention in the dispatches, the D. S. O., and the Queen's medal. He was first elected to Parliament from the Isle of Wight in 1900, and in 1906 was returned from Liverpool, and since 1910, from Derby. His first government position was that of under secretary for the colonies, which he held from 1908 to 1910. His elevation to the position of secretary of war—the exalted job now held by Kitchener of Khartoum—was a recognition of his military services. His resignation last year followed the public clamor incident to the Ulster disturbance. With Viscount Morley, lord president of the council, he drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French, lord commander of the British forces in France, also joined in these assurances. When Sir John French and Sir John Ewart persisted in resigning, Col. Seely drafted a document containing assurances to Brig-Gen. Gough that the troops in Ireland would not be used to suppress the Ulster opposition to home rule. Field Marshal John French